

Appl. No. 09/607,790
Amdt. Dated December 13, 2004
Reply to Office action of October 22, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P12172-US2
EUS/J/P/04-3309

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of claims 18-26.

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, 18 and 27. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Claim 18 is only amended to correct the antecedent error found in the last element. Accordingly, claims 1-28 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Examiner Objections - Claims

Claims 1, 11, 18 and 27 were objected to because of informalities. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the claims. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that the term "user plane" is a term of art and is properly used (for instance see page 2, line 16 and page 3 line 1).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1, 9, 11 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vikberg et al. (US 2004/0113,570 A1 hereinafter Vikberg) in view of Havinis, et al. (US 2003/0202,521 A1 hereinafter Havinis). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

In order to expedite allowance of this application, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 11 and 27 to include the allowable subject matter set forth in paragraph 9 of the Detailed Action. Support for the amendment is found on page 6, line 15 through page 7, line 8. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1 and now contains the allowable subject matter regarding the relationship with the logical points in the MGW and the control nodes. For

App! No. 09/507,790
Amdt. Dated December 13, 2004
Reply to Office action of October 22, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P12172-US2
EUS/J/P/04-3309

the above given reasons the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of this claim.

Claims 2, 12 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vikberg in view of Havinis and further in view of Valentine et al. (US 6,353,607 B1 hereinafter Valentine). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

Claims 2, 12 and 16 depend from claims 1 and 11 respectively and now contain the allowable subject matter regarding the relationship with the logical points in the MGW and the control nodes. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

Claims 3-8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vikberg in view of Havinis and further in view of Rautiola et al. (US 5,956,331 hereinafter Rautiola). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

Claims 3-8, and 10 depend from claim 1 and now contain the allowable subject matter regarding the relationship with the logical points in the MGW and the control nodes. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vikberg in view of Havinis and further in view of Kalmanek, Jr. et al. (US 6,324,279 B1 hereinafter Kalmanek, Jr.). The Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to incorporate the allowable subject matter so as to better define the intended scope of the claimed invention.

Claim 10 depends from claim 1 and now contains the allowable subject matter regarding the relationship with the logical points in the MGW and the control nodes. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of this claim.

Appl. No. 09/607,790
Amdt. Dated December 13, 2004
Reply to Office action of October 22, 2004
Attorney Docket No. F12172-US2
EUS/J/P/04-3309

Claims 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vikberg in view of Havinis and further in view of Joensuu et al. (US 5,878,347 hereinafter Joensuu). The Applicant has amended independent claim 11 to incorporate the allowable subject matter noted in the Detailed Action so as to better define the intended scope of the claimed invention.

Claims 13-15 depend from claim 11 and now contain the allowable subject matter regarding the relationship with the logical points in the MGW and the control nodes. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vikberg in view of Havinis and further in view of Valentine et al. (US 6,219,546 hereinafter Valentine). The Applicant has amended independent claim 11 to incorporate the allowable subject matter so as to better define the intended scope of the claimed invention.

Claim 17 depends from claim 11 and now contains the allowable subject matter regarding the relationship with the logical points in the MGW and the control nodes. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vikberg in view of Havinis and further in view of Edson (US 6,526,581 B1). The Applicant has amended independent claim 27 to incorporate the allowable subject matter in claim 18 noted in the Detailed Action so as to better define the intended scope of the claimed invention.

Claim 28 depends from claim 27 and now contains the allowable subject matter regarding the relationship with the logical points in the MGW and the control nodes. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.


Appl. No. 09/607,790
Amdt. Dated December 13, 2004
Reply to Office action of October 22, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P12172-US2
EUS/J/P/04-3309

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,


By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: December 13, 2004

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com